UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,003	02/25/2005	Helmut Seidlitz	HAFTOM P02AUS	9610
	7590 10/20/200 LD & Daniels, P.L.L.C.	EXAMINER		
112 PLEASAN CONCORD, NI	T STREET	DRODGE, JOSEPH W		
CONCORD, IN	11 03301		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/526,003	SEIDLITZ ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Joseph W. Droage	1797						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the second sec	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better the second of the content of	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);						
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		10 133003 101					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	-	-					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-11 and 13-17</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but see below.		condition for allowand	ce because:					
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☒ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Joseph W. Drodge/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797						

Continuation of 13. Other: Proposed amending of claims 9 and 11 by substituting "liquid gas" instead of "supercritical or liquid carbon dioxide" would constitute New Issues since (1) this change is broadening pertaining to any normally gaseous substance instead of limited to carbon dioxide as originally claimed and since (2) "supercritical" and "liquid" are not necessarily synonymous, carbon dioxide can be in liquid form based on temperature and/or pressure without being in supercritical form; also reciting of "separate" discharge openings for liquid to be treated and compressed liquid gas would be a New Issue. The claim formerly read on a plurality of openings each discharging both liquid/dispersion and compressed liquid gas.

Amending of claims 9 and 11 to recite a liquid gas broadly, is not supported by page 8 of the Specification which only recites carbon dioxide solvent and does not encompass any other liquid gas and would thus be New Matter.

The Arguments are also not persuasive. It is argued that in Podbielniak '796, that carbon dioxide is not employed as a solvent and not involved in the extraction process. However, the claims do not require that carbon dioxide or other liquid gas be a solvent, per se. Page 3, column 2, lines 54-63 explicitly state that the vapors and liquid introduced in counter-current are "employed" or otherwise involved in various extraction processes. The claims do not limit how the carbon dioxide is used.

It is also argued that the surface of the thin film is constantly renewed by mechanically acting on the liquid or dispersion, meaning use of rods, scrapers, wipers or rollers on such surface. It is submitted that "mechanically acting..." has been interpreted more broadly, The instant specification at pages 5-7 infers that application of shearing or centrifugal forces qualify as the claimed "mechanically acting"; continued application of centrifugal force is disclosed by '796 at page 2, column 2, lines 14-18.

/Joseph Drodge/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797